To list Stewart's numerous accomplishments only tells half the story. Stewart is a great man. He always had tremendous love for family, especially his late wife, Dorothy. Dorothy was not just Stewart's wife, she was his very best friend.

I have had the honor and privilege of calling Stewart a longtime friend and trusted advisor for many years. Our community has benefited greatly from his generosity and his goodwill. To put it simply, the Quad Cities is a better place to live because of Stewart Winstein.

I would like to join Stewart's son, Arthur, his stepson, Max, and all of his family and friends in wishing him a very happy 95th birthday.

THE FAIR TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. INGLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to ask my colleagues that may be supporters of the Fair Tax whether we have got some parallel idea that we have been, that I have been talking about on this House floor for a while now.

In the Fair Tax, what happens is you reduce taxes, income taxes, payroll taxes, those sorts of things, and you impose a tax on consumption. And the very good idea behind that is that you want to tax the things that you don't necessarily want to incentivize, and you want to free up from taxation those things that you do want to incentivize.

So right now, under our current Tax Code, savings and investing, investments are treated shabbily in the Tax Code. Consumption is treated pretty well, because if you are a business, you can deduct those things. And so the idea is to turn that around. That's one of the good arguments for the Fair Tax.

Now, of course, the downside of the Fair Tax is that it comes with a pretty substantial increase in the price of goods sold if they are new goods because it's a substantial consumption tax, perhaps 23 percent. Of course, Fair Tax proponents immediately point out that that wouldn't be the actual total increase in the price of a good because the income tax assumptions would come out of the pricing of that product; and so the dollar candy bar wouldn't be a $1.23, it would be something less than a $1.23 because the candy bar company would not have to pay income taxes, nor would the sugar company and all the components. Good arguments.

So I am wondering if it's the same thing as what I've been talking about with a revenue-neutral carbon tax, the same kind of deal, that what we are doing here is we are switching what you tax, swapping out one tax for another.

So in the concept that I have been describing here in a series of Special Orders, what we would do is we would reduce taxes on payroll, and that's something we want more of, labor industry income, and we would impose a tax, essentially a consumption tax, on carbon dioxide.

□ 1945

The result would be that the things that would be incentivized would be payroll, which is again labor, industry work. The thing that would be disincentivized would be carbon emissions.

Now, the interesting thing is that it's sort of the son of fair tax, a much smaller impact than fair tax—what I'm talking about here when it comes to the dollar shock—because in the case of the fair tax, gasoline, presumably, would go up by a 23 percent sales tax. Natural gas would have a 23 percent sales tax. Electricity would have a 23 percent sales tax on it. Now, of course, some of that would be knocked down by the income tax assumptions coming out of the provisions of those products, but the result would be a switch in taxes in the fair taxes. It would be a big, old switch from income taxes and from those sorts of things—payroll tax—to a consumption tax. What I'm talking about is that it would be sort of a small version of that where you would take reduced payroll taxes and then would impose a tax on carbon dioxide, but the difference between the two is this:

In what I'm talking about, there would be an incentive to switch technologies, too. In the fair tax, you are talking about just hitting every new product sold with a 23 percent sales tax. In the case that I'm talking about, you would be just targeting one particular kind of product. The result would be that nuclear would be possible, that all kinds of new transportation fuels would be possible and that we would be breaking this addiction to oil, cleaning up the air and creating new jobs in this sort of son of fair tax, in this little, small version of a fair tax. That is the fair tax plus this very important technology shift.

That's what I'm after, Mr. Speaker, is that technology shift that can give us an expansion of this economy and be part of the means of our growing out of this recession. We did it in the '90s with the productivity we got out of the Internet and the PC. I think we can do it again now with energy. Energy security is our ticket out of this recession. Similar to the tech boom in the 1990s, this is our opportunity to grow the economy and to clean up the air, to create jobs and, by the way, to help balance the Federal budget, because that's what happened in the late '90s. The growth of the economy because of the productivity from the Internet and the PC gave us new revenues.

I think we can do the same thing in energy, but the start of it is getting the economics right, and if we do that, Mr. Speaker, I think we can help change the energy insecurity of the United States into energy security. It all starts with economics and with free enterprise making it happen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

U.S. STRATEGY IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, just last week, the House approved a $96.7 billion spending bill that provides funding for our military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. I joined many of my House colleagues in voting for this funding. Our men and women in uniform and troops in the field deserve the best training and equipment our Nation can provide.

While America's military personnel faithfully conduct their mission abroad, elected officials here in Washington should take seriously their responsibility to develop a viable, long-term strategy for these operations. I have always voiced my support for the United States military action to topple the Taliban in Afghanistan following the tragedy of September 11. Yet, nearly 8 years later, I am concerned that the United States has not articulated a clear strategy for victory or an end point to our efforts in that country.

Because of this concern, I join more than 70 Members of Congress in cosponsoring H.R. 2404, Congressman JIM MCGOVERN's legislation to require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress outlining the exit strategy for the United States military forces in Afghanistan. Without focus and targeted objectives, adding more manpower to our efforts in Afghanistan could cause the United States to go the way of many great armies and leave our troops in never-ending, no-win situations.

Many world leaders have noted that military action in Afghanistan alone is not going to free us of terrorism. Colonel Douglas McGregor, a veteran of Vietnam, put it well when he recently wrote for the Armed Forces Journal: ''When national military strategy fails to answer the question of purpose, method and end state, military power becomes an engine of destruction, not just for its intended enemies but for its supporting society and economy, too.''

The United States continues to devote its blood and treasure in Afghanistan while the Afghan Government has yet to purge itself of many who are funneling support to the Taliban. Meanwhile, here at home, money and manpower are needed to address our Nation's serious economic concerns and to protect our citizens from the violence at our southern border with